



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/491,899	01/27/2000	William R. Wells	3735-929	9213
27717	7590	01/27/2004	EXAMINER	
SEYFARTH SHAW 55 EAST MONROE STREET SUITE 4200 CHICAGO, IL 60603-5803			ORTIZ, BELIX M	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2175	12	

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/491,899	WELLS ET AL.
	Examiner Belix M. Ortiz	Art Unit 2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

DIANE D. MIZRAHI
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 210

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 January 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2,5,6,8,10. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the drawings: character "119", in page 6, lines 10 and 12 and character "34", in page 7, line 2, are not described on the drawings. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: in figure 2, reference character "216" and "234"; and in figure 3, reference character "384", are not described in the written description. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
3. Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this Office action. However, formal correction of the noted defect may be deferred until after the examiner has considered the proposed drawing

correction. Failure to timely submit the proposed drawing correction will result in the abandonment of the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 2-5, 9-11, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 2 and 9 recite the limitation "said biometric data storage device is provided in a card having a thickness less than about .05 inches", which is subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 16 recite the limitation "said means for storing is provided in a card having a thickness less than about 1/4 inches", which is subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 3, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as being dependent from rejected dependent claim 2.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as being dependent from rejected dependent claim 9.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

7. Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Walker et al. (U.S. patent 6,010,404).

As to claim 21, Walker et al. teaches a method for creating a player identification usable in a gaming environment and having at least two authenticators (see column 3, lines 1-7), the method comprising:

- (a) creating a first authenticator (see column 3, lines 29-31; column 3, lines 63-67);
- (b) entering at least one more authenticator in the form of biometric data (see column 4, lines 4-10);
- (c) associating said first authenticator and said at least one more authenticator with a player (see column 3, lines 4-7);

(d) providing player identification at a game device having an associated biometric reader using said first authenticator and at least one of said at least one more authenticators, where said first authenticator is a data storage device (see column 3, lines 58-67; column 4, lines 1-14).

As to claim 22, Walker et al. teaches a method for creating a player identification usable in a gaming environment and having at least two authenticators (see column 3, lines 1-7), the method comprising:

- (a) creating a first authenticator (see column 3, lines 29-31; column 3, lines 63-67);
- (b) entering at least one more authenticator in the form of biometric data (see column 4, lines 4-10);
- (c) associating said first authenticator and said at least one more authenticator with a player and further identifying said first authenticator as an authenticator that will be the authenticator used for searching and identifying said player in a player identification database (see column 6, lines 16-24); and
- (d) providing player identification at a game device having an associated biometric reader using said first authenticator and at least one of said at least one more authenticators (see column 3, lines 58-67; column 4, lines 1-14).

As to claim 23, Walker et al. teaches A method for enabling electronic transfers using at least two authenticators where any authenticator that is not the first authenticator uses biometric data, in a gaming environment while using a game device having an associated biometric reader (see column 2, lines 42-64), the method comprising:

- (a) having a first authenticator readable by a reader associated with said game device (see column 2, lines 4-9 where “first authentication” is read on “numerical”; column 3, lines 1-3);
- (b) having a second authenticator different from said first authenticator and readable by a reader associated with said game device (see column 2, lines 4-9 where “second authentication” is read on “biometric or physical”);
- (c) having an entry in a player identification database, where said entry further comprises first authenticator data and second authenticator data (see column 2, lines 20-28);
- (d) uniquely associating a player using a game device with an entry in said player identification database and recognizing a player request for an electronic transfer (see column 2, lines 20-28);
- (e) acknowledging a desired electronic transfer (see column 3, lines 4-7);
- (f) using said second authenticator to confirm and authorize said desired electronic transfer (see column 6, lines 20-26; column 6, lines 47-64).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 15, 17, and 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (U.S. patent 6,010,404) in view of Matchett et al. (U.S patent 5,229,764).

As to claim 1, Walker et al. teaches a gaming apparatus (see abstract) comprising:

a portable biometric data storage device storing first biometric data for at least a first user (see column 5, lines 17-19; column 6, lines 16-24);

a gaming terminal, configured for playing at least first game (see column 6, lines 60-62);

a reader, coupled to the gaming terminal which receives said first biometric data stored on said biometric data storage device (see column 3, lines 58-62);

a biometric measurement device for measuring biometric data of a user to

provide measured biometric data (see column 8, lines 23-25).

Walker et al. does not teach a comparator for comparing said measured biometric data to said first biometric data and outputting at least a first notification if there is an absence of match.

Matchett et al. teaches continuous biometric authentication matrix (see abstract), in which he teaches a comparator for comparing said measured biometric data to said first biometric data and outputting at least a first notification if there is an absence of match (see column 3, lines 29-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al. to include a comparator for comparing said measured biometric data to said first biometric data and outputting at least a first notification if there is an absence of match.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al. by the teaching of Matchett et al., because a comparator for comparing said measured biometric data to said first biometric data and outputting at least a first notification if there is an absence of match, would enable the gaming terminal to know what player can use the terminal depending of the comparator and will alert the player that something is wrong with the authentication.

As to claim 6, Walker et al. as modified teaches Apparatus wherein:
said biometric measurement device is selected from among:
a thumb print scanner;
a fingerprint scanner;
a retina scanner;
a iris scanner;
an ear scanner;
a voice data sensor;
a facial scanner; or
an infrared scanner (see Walker et al., column 4, lines 4-7).

As to claim 8, Walker et al. teaches a gaming method comprising:
storing first biometric data for at least a first user in a portable biometric
data storage device (see column 5, lines 17-19; column 6, lines 16-24);
a gaming terminal (see abstract);
coupling a reader to a gaming terminal, configured for playing at least first
game, wherein said reader receives said first biometric data stored on said
biometric data storage device (see column 3, lines 58-62; column 6, lines 60-
62);
measuring biometric data of a user to provide measured biometric data
(see column 8, lines 23-25).

Walker et al. does not teach a comparing said measured biometric data to said first biometric data and outputting at least a first notification if there is an absence of match.

Matchett et al. teaches continuous biometric authentication matrix (see abstract), in which he teaches comparing said measured biometric data to said first biometric data and outputting at least a first notification if there is an absence of match (see column 3, lines 29-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al. to include comparing said measured biometric data to said first biometric data and outputting at least a first notification if there is an absence of match.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al. by the teaching of Matchett et al., because comparing said measured biometric data to said first biometric data and outputting at least a first notification if there is an absence of match, would enable the gaming terminal to know what player can use the terminal depending of the comparator and will alert the player that something is wrong with the authentication.

As to claim 13, Walker et al. as modified, teaches a method wherein:
said step of measuring includes a step selected from among:

scanning a thumb print;
scanning a fingerprint;
scanning a retina;
scanning an iris;
scanning an ear;
sensing a voice data; or
scanning a face (see Walker et al., column 4, lines 4-7).

As to claim 15, Walker et al. teaches a gaming apparatus (see abstract) comprising:

portable means for storing first biometric data for at least a first user (see column 5, lines 17-19; column 6, lines 16-24);

gaming terminal means for playing at least first game (see column 6, lines 60-62);

reader means for receiving said first biometric data stored on said portable means for storing (see column 3, lines 58-62);

means for measuring biometric data of a user to provide measured biometric data (see column 8, lines 23-25).

Walker et al. does not teach means for comparing said measured biometric data to said first biometric data and outputting at least a first notification if there is an absence of match.

Matchett et al. teaches continuous biometric authentication matrix (see abstract), in which he teaches means for comparing said measured biometric data to said first biometric data and outputting at least a first notification if there is an absence of match (see column 3, lines 29-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al. to include means for comparing said measured biometric data to said first biometric data and outputting at least a first notification if there is an absence of match.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al. by the teaching of Matchett et al., because means for comparing said measured biometric data to said first biometric data and outputting at least a first notification if there is an absence of match, would enable the gaming terminal to know what player can use the terminal depending of the comparator and will alert the player that something is wrong with the authentication.

As to claim 17, Walker et al. as modified teaches apparatus wherein: said means for storing includes a microprocessor (see Matchett et al., column 5, lines 16-24).

As to claim 19, Walker et al. as modified teaches Apparatus wherein:

Said means for measuring is selected from among:

- a thumb print scanner means;
- a fingerprint scanner means;
- a retina scanner means;
- a iris scanner means;
- an ear scanner means;
- a voice data sensor means; or
- a facial scanner means (see Walker et al., column 4, lines 4-7).

10. Claims 2, 9, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (U.S. patent 6,010,404) in view of Matchett et al. (U.S patent 5,229,764) as applied to claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 15, 17, and 19 above, and further in view of Danielson et al. (U.S. patent 6,149,062).

As to claims 2, 9, and 16, Walker et al. as modified does not teach Apparatus wherein:

 said biometric data storage device is provided in a card having a thickness less than about 0.05 inches.

Danielson et al. teaches a hand held data processing system of modular structure includes a base unit that couples with a reader unit (see abstract), in which he teaches apparatus wherein:

said biometric data storage device is provided in a card having a thickness less than about 0.05 inches (see column 26, lines 5-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al. as modified, to include apparatus wherein:

said biometric data storage device is provided in a card having a thickness less than about 0.05 inches.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al. as modified, by the teaching of Danielson et al., because apparatus wherein: said biometric data storage device is provided in a card having a thickness less than about 0.05 inches, would enable the card to fit in an ordinary shirt pocket. It would be very convenient for the players, because is more easy to use and the player don't have to carry any cash or tokens.

11. Claims 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (U.S. patent 6,010,404) in view of Matchett et al. (U.S patent 5,229,764) and further in view of Danielson et al. (U.S. patent 6,149,062) as applied to claims 2, 9, and 16 above, and still in view of Montgomery et al. (U.S. patent 6,157,966).

As to claims 3 and 10, Walker et al. as modified still doesn't teach apparatus wherein:

 said card includes a microprocessor.

Montgomery et al. teaches a smart card comprises a microcontroller, a memory unit, a storage unit, and a communications unit (see abstract), in which he teaches apparatus wherein:

 said card includes a microprocessor (see column 7, lines 20-27).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al., as modified, to include apparatus wherein:

 said card includes a microprocessor.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al. as modified, by the teaching of Montgomery et al., because apparatus wherein:

 said card includes a microprocessor, would enable the apparatus to executes smart card software and programs, carries out terminal instructions, and generally manages the flow of data.

12. Claims 4-5, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (U.S. patent 6,010,404) in view of Matchett et al. (U.S patent 5,229,764) and further in view of Danielson et al. (U.S. patent

6,149,062) as applied to claims 2, 9, and 16 above, and still in view of Raven et al. (U.S. patent 5,429,361).

As to claims 4 and 11, Walker et al. as modified does not teach apparatus wherein:

said card is a debit card.

Raven et al. teaches gaming machine information, communication and display system (see abstract), in which he teaches apparatus wherein:

said card is a debit card (see column 11, lines 36-37).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al., as modified, to include apparatus wherein:

said card is a debit card.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al. as modified, by the teaching of Raven et al., because apparatus wherein:

said card is a debit card, would enable the apparatus to keep track of credits and debits, current balance is shown on the display. When the player is finished playing, he can check his balance on the display and then remove his card.

As to claim 5, Walker et al. as modified does not teach apparatus wherein:

said card further stores the current account balance for an account established for said first user.

Raven et al. teaches gaming machine information, communication and display system (see abstract), in which he teaches apparatus wherein:

 said card further stores the current account balance for an account established for said first user (see column 11, lines 11-23).

 Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al., as modified, to include apparatus wherein:

 said card further stores the current account balance for an account established for said first user.

 It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al. as modified, by the teaching of Raven et al., because apparatus wherein:

 said card further stores the current account balance for an account established for said first user, would enable the apparatus to once the balance has been verified, the player can proceed with game play and the current balance can be display for the player.

13. Claims 7, 12, 14, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (U.S. patent 6,010,404) in view of Matchett et

al. (U.S patent 5,229,764) as applied to claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 15, 17, and 19 above, and further in view of Raven et al. (U.S. patent 5,429,361).

As to claim 7, Walker et al. teaches a gaming terminal (see abstract) comprising:

at least a first control device which initiates or controls playing of a game (see column 1, lines 33-35);

at least a first output device which outputs results of game play (see column 2, lines 63-65; column 3, lines 45-46);

a biometric measurement device which obtains biometric measured information relating to a prospective game player (see column 8, lines 23-25);

Walker et al. does not teach a microprocessor which compares said measured biometric information to stored biometric information;

said microprocessor configured to charge wagers, in connection with said game, against a pre-established account only if said measured biometric information sufficiently closely matches said stored biometric information.

Matchett et al. teaches continuous biometric authentication matrix (see abstract), in which he teaches a microprocessor which compares said measured biometric information to stored biometric information (see column 5, lines 16-29);

said microprocessor configured to charge wagers, in connection with said game, against a pre-established account only if said measured biometric

information sufficiently closely matches said stored biometric information (see column 12, lines 31-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al., to include a microprocessor which compares said measured biometric information to stored biometric information;

said microprocessor configured to charge wagers, in connection with said game, against a pre-established account only if said measured biometric information sufficiently closely matches said stored biometric information.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al. by the teaching of Matchett et al., because a microprocessor which compares said measured biometric information to stored biometric information; said microprocessor configured to charge wagers, in connection with said game, against a pre-established account only if said measured biometric information sufficiently closely matches said stored biometric information, would enable the method to use on the future the biometric information stored by the microprocessor and the gaming terminal will know what player can use the terminal depending of the comparator and will alert the player that something is wrong with the authentication.

Walker et al. as modified, still does not teach wherein said gaming terminal is provided in the absence of coin handling, token handling or currency handling equipment.

Raven et al. teaches gaming machine information, communication and display system (see abstract), in which he teaches wherein said gaming terminal is provided in the absence of coin handling, token handling or currency handling equipment (see column 10, lines 38-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al., as modified, to include wherein said gaming terminal is provided in the absence of coin handling, token handling or currency handling equipment.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al. as modified, by the teaching of Raven et al., because wherein said gaming terminal is provided in the absence of coin handling, token handling or currency handling equipment, would enable the user to be more secure and relax, because not have to carry cash or with a lot of token on his/her pocked.

As to claims 12 and 18, Walker et al. as modified does not teach a method further comprising:

storing, on said biometric data storage device, the current account balance for an account established for said first user.

Raven et al. teaches gaming machine information, communication and display system (see abstract), in which he teaches a method further comprising:

storing, on said biometric data storage device, the current account balance for an account established for said first user (see column 11, lines 11-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al., as modified, to include a method further comprising:

storing, on said biometric data storage device, the current account balance for an account established for said first user.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al. as modified, by the teaching of Raven et al., because a method further comprising:

storing, on said biometric data storage device, the current account balance for an account established for said first user, would enable the gaming terminal to verified the amount of money, the player have to play or to bet.

As to claims 14 and 20, Walker et al. teaches a gaming method (see abstract) comprising:

initiating or controlling playing of a game using at least a first control device (see column 1, lines 33-35);
outputting results of game play using at least a first output device (see column 2, lines 63-65; column 3, lines 45-46);
obtaining biometric measured information relating to a prospective game player using a biometric measurement device (see column 8, lines 23-25);

Walker et al. does not teach comparing said measured biometric information to stored biometric information;
charging wagers, in connection with said game, against a pre-established account only if said measured biometric information sufficiently closely matches said stored biometric information.

Matchett et al. teaches continuous biometric authentication matrix (see abstract), in which he teaches comparing said measured biometric information to stored biometric information (see column 5, lines 16-29);
charging wagers, in connection with said game, against a pre-established account only if said measured biometric information sufficiently closely matches said stored biometric information (see column 12, lines 31-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al., to include comparing said measured biometric information to stored biometric information;

charging wagers, in connection with said game, against a pre-established account only if said measured biometric information sufficiently closely matches said stored biometric information.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al. by the teaching of Matchett et al., because comparing said measured biometric information to stored biometric information;

charging wagers, in connection with said game, against a pre-established account only if said measured biometric information sufficiently closely matches said stored biometric information, would enable the method to use on the future the biometric information stored by the microprocessor and the gaming terminal will know what player can use the terminal depending of the comparator and will alert the player that something is wrong with the authentication.

Walker et al. as modified, still does not teach wherein said gaming terminal is provided in the absence of coin handling, token handling or currency handling equipment.

Raven et al. teaches gaming machine information, communication and display system (see abstract), in which he teaches wherein said gaming terminal is provided in the absence of coin handling, token handling or currency handling equipment (see column 10, lines 38-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al., as modified, to include wherein said gaming terminal is provided in the absence of coin handling, token handling or currency handling equipment.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walker et al. as modified, by the teaching of Raven et al., because wherein said gaming terminal is provided in the absence of coin handling, token handling or currency handling equipment, would enable the user to be more secure and relax, because not have to carry cash or with a lot of token on his/her pocked.

Conclusion

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Belix M. Ortiz whose telephone number is 703-305-7605. The examiner can normally be reached on moday-friday 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 703-305-3830. The

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

bmo

December 23, 2003.

DIANE D. MIZRAHI
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100